

management. Here, it was explained that LCA is used in those cases where the application of the waste management hierarchy is not feasible (e.g. when comparing alternatives within one level of the order of preference) or does not seem to be satisfactory. For a means of communication, the LCA results are limited to the dominant impacts. Finally, the application of LCA for the eco-design of a kitchen was presented (M. Goedkoop/R. Spriensma, PRé Consultants). It was shown that LCA can be very helpful in the collaboration of several SMEs working together since it can be used as a guiding instrument. For communicating results to the public, energy use was found to be suitable.

Summarizing the poster presentations, which mainly dealt with decision-making, the observers (J. Potting and T. Ekvall) noted that weighting, although not 'allowed' for comparative assertions by ISO 14042, is widely used for internal decision-making.

In the general discussion, the opponents (S. Cowell and G. Norris) drew the picture of the 'two LCA-planets', where the session on uncertainty and data quality represented the one 'planet' and the case studies in the second session the other 'planet'. This started a very lively exchange which concluded that both 'planets' are of essential importance, but that one has to distinguish carefully between the actual process of con-

ducting an LCA and the presentation of the results to the relevant decision-makers who have a business background.

This very intensive symposium concluded with a panel discussion on critical review: its role, the obstacles and future perspectives. The panelists (K. Christiansen, A. de Groot, W. Klöpffer, and K. Saur) all agreed that critical reviews (CR) – if done properly – enhance the internal and external credibility of LCA. The real value added, though, can only be achieved if a review is carried out in parallel to a study, because the quality of the LCA can then be significantly improved. There was also a broad consensus on the obstacles involving extra costs (10% of study costs, minimum of 10,000 Euro), higher project management requirements, and possible time delays. The need for exact specifications for conducting CRs (e.g., contents of CR, process of CR), the benefit of a certification procedure for LCA (as for EMAS), the usefulness of established lists with accredited reviewers, etc. was controversially discussed by the panelists and the audience. However, all panelists were of the opinion that the use of critical reviews is an issue SETAC should deal with more intensely in the future.

Gerald Rebitzer

Technical University Berlin, Waste Minimization and Recycling
Straße des 17. Juni 135, KF 6, D-10623 Berlin, Germany
rebitzer@itu301.ut.TU-Berlin.de

Conference Proceedings with the presented papers are available from SETAC Europe
(email: setac@setaceu.org, T: +32-2/772-7281, F: +32-2/770-5386, website: www.setaceu.org).

LCM 2001 Copenhagen • August 27-29 • 2001

1st International Conference On Life Cycle Management

Monday 27 August 2001

Opening session and plenary sessions on:

- Sustainability
- Why LCM?
- What is LCM?
- LCM in practice.

Poster discussion session

Exhibition opens

Evening reception

Tuesday 28 August 2001

Three parallel platform sessions on:

- Sustainability indicators
- Environmental performance
- Data assessment and management
- Life cycle costing
- Integrated Product Policy (IPP)
- Eco-design

- Social and ethical values
 - Stakeholder participation
 - Supply chain management
 - Environmental product declarations (EPD)
 - Environmental labelling
 - Life cycle management and automaking
- Posters and exhibition
Conference dinner

Wednesday 29 August 2001

Plenary sessions on:

- Integration of concepts and tools
 - Communication and decision making
- Poster summary session and poster prizes
Posters and exhibition
Plenary discussion on future developments
Closing session
Optional evening tour

Final deadline for abstract submission is 15 May 2001